

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 4-6, 12, and 16-31 are pending in the application; claims 22-31 are newly added. No new matter is added.

The Office action rejects claims 4-7, 12, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Harris et al. (USP 6,331,972, hereinafter Harris). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Harris does not teach presenting to a user an icon that is representative of an item and an associated service field in response to received identity information, the icon being movable within the service field to facilitate user interaction with the service field, as specifically claimed in independent claim 4. Independent claims 16 and 26 include similar features.

The Office action notes that FIG. 20 of Harris corresponds to a service field, and asserts that the icons 311 correspond to the claimed icon that is representative of the item. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Each icon 311 corresponds to a particular function of the item; no icon 311 is representative of the item, per se. The Examiner asserts that the two concentric circles with a horizontal and vertical line of the icon 311 is representative of a VCR, but provides no basis for this assertion.

Harris specifically states that the illustrated display 309 is "showing icons 311 corresponding to available commands" (Harris, column 18, lines 47-48). This is the only description of icons 311 provided by Harris. Harris does not teach that the icons 311 are representative of the VCR, but only that the icons 311 correspond to available commands.

Harris also does not teach that an icon representing the item is moved based on actions of the user for interacting with the service field, as also claimed in amended claims 4, 16, and 26.

Because Harris does not teach presenting an icon that is representative of an item and an associated service field in response to received identity information of the item, and does not teach that such an icon is moved within the service field based on actions of the user to facilitate interaction with the service field, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 4-6, 12, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Harris should be withdrawn.

With regard to select dependent claims, the applicants note that Harris also does not teach that the information that is transmitted to the item includes information particular to a user of the item; does not teach that the information that is transmitted to the item includes a state of the application program; does not teach that the identity information is substantially unique to the item, and the icon is correspondingly substantially unique to the item; does not teach that one or more characteristics of the icon is user definable; does not teach that the icon corresponds to a shape of the item; and does not teach that the icon is animated.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/  
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.  
Reg. 41,508  
804-493-0707

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001